



Frederick County Local Management Board

Community Wide Needs Assessment

Determining the Strengths, Gaps and
Opportunities in the Human Service System for
Children and Families in Frederick County

Frederick County Office for Children and Families

Home of the Frederick County Local Management Board
520 North Market Street
Frederick, MD 21701

Introduction

Frederick County, Maryland comprises the largest geographic area in the state and the seventh highest population. Frederick County's population continues to grow both in diversity and density, as the county saw the sixth largest population increase from 2000-2009 (16.7%) within the state. Frederick County has 70,000 households and nearly 49,000 children. It is these children, and the system of care that supports them, that is the focus of the Frederick County Local Management Board.

In the fall of 2009, the Frederick County Local Management Board (LMB) began the process of developing an action plan to address the human service needs of Frederick County's children and families. The first step was to conduct a county-wide needs assessment to identify both the strengths and resources, as well as the gaps and challenges, deemed to be present in the current system of services and resources for children, youth and families. The needs assessment provides a framework for the Frederick County Local Management Board to develop a system of services and solutions aimed at building a local system of care which supports and empowers children and youth and their families.

In a thoughtful manner which built on the success and community-wide utility of the FY07 needs assessment, Frederick County's LMB was determined to implement a meaningful, multi-faceted and cost-sensitive assessment which relied on the human resources of LMB staff and board members in collecting community information. Multiple mechanisms were utilized to gather and report county-wide data:

U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-year estimates

Maryland Results and Indicators for Childhood Well-Being

29 Focus Groups

6 LMB Committee / Community Provider Focus Groups

10 Family Focus Groups

13 Youth Focus Groups

Web Based Surveys

Frederick County Demographic Data

U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey 3-year estimates.

American Factfinder Data

General Characteristics

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Total Population	223787	(X)	(X)
Male	110543	49.4	49.30%
Female	113244	50.6	50.70%
Median age (years)	36.5	(X)	36.7
Under 5 years	15627	7	6.90%
18 years and over	165911	74.1	75.50%
65 years and over	22427	10	12.60%
One race	219663	98.2	97.80%
White	186184	83.2	74.30%
Black or African American	18679	8.3	12.30%
American Indian and Alaska Native	871	0.4	0.80%
Asian	8006	3.6	4.40%

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.10%
Some other race	5923	2.6	5.80%
Two or more races	4124	1.8	2.20%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	12582	5.6	15.10%

Social Characteristics

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Population 25 years and over	146243	(X)	(X)
High school graduate or higher	(X)	91.5	84.50%
Bachelor's degree or higher	(X)	34.6	27.40%
Civilian veterans (civilian population 18 years and over)	19190	11.6	10.10%
With a Disability	(X)	(X)	(X)
Foreign born	18797	8.4	12.50%

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Male, Now married, except separated (population 15 years and over)	49640	57.6	52.20%
Female, Now married, except separated (population 15 years and over)	48224	53.5	48.20%
Speak a language other than English at home (population 5 years and over)	22605	10.9	19.60%

Economic Characteristics

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
In labor force (population 16 years and over)	126350	72.9	65.20%
Mean travel time to work in minutes (workers 16 years and over)	33.8	(X)	25.3
Median household income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	79002	(X)	52175
Median family income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	92695	(X)	63211

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Per capita income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	34570	(X)	27466
Families below poverty level	(X)	3	9.60%
Individuals below poverty level	(X)	4.9	13.20%

Housing Characteristics

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Average household size	2.68	(X)	2.61
Average family size	3.17	(X)	3.2
Household population	218476	(X)	(X)
Group quarters population	(X)	(X)	(X)
Total housing units	86166	(X)	(X)
Occupied housing units	81491	94.6	88%
Owner-occupied housing units	62028	76.1	67.10%
Renter-occupied housing units	19463	23.9	32.90%

Characteristic	Estimate	Percent	U.S. Average
Vacant housing units	4675	5.4	12%
Owner-occupied homes	62028	(X)	(X)
Median value (dollars)	369300	(X)	192400
With a mortgage (dollars)	2008	(X)	1508
Not mortgaged (dollars)	468	(X)	425

'(X)' - The value is not applicable or not available.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey

Maryland Results and Indicators: Frederick County

Low Birth Weight, 2004-2009

Definition: The rate of low birth weight is the percentage of babies born weighing 2,500 grams (5.5 lbs) or less at birth.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **13th** lowest percentage of babies born weighing less than 2,500 grams in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	8.3%	6.9%	7.5%	8.3%	8.0%	7.9%
Carroll	7.8%	7.6%	7.2%	6.3%	6.9%	7.4%
Harford	8.1%	7.6%	8.7%	7.7%	7.4%	7.6%
Howard	7.5%	7.3%	7.6%	7.7%	8.6%	8.6%
Montgomery	8.5%	8.3%	8.7%	7.8%	7.9%	8.2%
Washington	6.7%	6.9%	8.7%	7.9%	6.1%	7.1%
Maryland	9.4%	9.2%	9.4%	9.1%	9.3%	9.2%

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Low Birthweight) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Early Prenatal Care, 2004-2009

Definition: Early Prenatal Care is the percentage of all births where prenatal care was initiated in the first trimester of pregnancy.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County ranked **19th** for women receiving early prenatal care in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	83.5%	79.2%	76.7%	75.4%	78.2%	80.3%
Carroll	95.3%	93.3%	91.3%	90.2%	90.7%	90.7%
Harford	90.1%	87.9%	88.0%	85.1%	84.2%	85.0%
Howard	94.7%	95.2%	94.7%	95.0%	94.6%	92.3%
Montgomery	80.3%	79.2%	81.0%	83.3%	84.0%	81.0%
Washington	81.2%	81.0%	77.8%	79.6%	80.2%	79.6%
Maryland	82.3%	81.3%	80.4%	79.5%	80.3%	80.2%

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Women without early prenatal care) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Note: While this indicator informs us of the percentage of births where prenatal care was initiated during the first trimester, it does not indicate the adequacy of the care or if care was continued throughout the pregnancy.

Teen Birth Rate, 2004-2009

Definition: This is a population-based rate of the number of births to women ages 15-19, per 1,000 women 15-19.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 7th lowest teen birth rate of women ages 15-19 in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	22.8	21.8	23.7	26.1	24.2	22.9
Carroll	16.9	18.8	21.2	21.2	17.1	14.2
Harford	22.6	21.6	21.3	26.1	20.0	19.7
Howard	12.4	14.0	11.1	14.1	13.8	12.9
Montgomery	17.9	20.1	21.6	22.0	20.9	20.3
Washington	48.6	46.4	48.9	58.0	46.9	40.8
Maryland	32.3	31.8	33.6	34.4	32.7	31.2

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Teen Birth Rate) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Infant Mortality, 2004-2009

Definition: Infant mortality rate is the number of infants who die before their first birthday per 1,000 live births.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **12th** lowest infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	5.1	6.6	4.5	3.9	8.4	3.8
Carroll	3.0	3.1	4.3	4.8	3.4	4.5
Harford	5.7	3.7	5.9	8.3	5.4	3.2
Howard	8.6	6.3	5.3	4.6	3.8	6.9
Montgomery	7.2	6.1	7.1	5.9	5.6	5.5
Washington	2.9	4.6	7.9	5.6	5.5	7.4
Maryland	8.5	7.3	7.9	8.0	8.0	7.2

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Infant Mortality) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Child Death Rate, 2002-2007

Definition: Child death rate is a population-based rate of the number of deaths resulting from all causes per 100,000 children 1-19.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **16th** lowest child death rate per 100,000 children 1-19, in 2007.

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Frederick	25.4 (15)	25.2 (15)	28.0 (17)	18.0 (11)	45.3 (27)	31.0 (19)
Carroll	26.8	26.8	39.8	28.8	25.1	20.3
Harford	42.0	21.7	26.1	19.8	33.0	33.0
Howard	20.2	33.5	25.3	20.0	27.3	23.2
Montgomery	13.5	18.4	22.5	21.8	17.7	21.8
Washington	18.4	45.7	26.8	44.5	48.4	29.1
Maryland	33.3	34.5	33.7	29.8	30.7	34.3

Data Source: Governor's Office for Children – Results and Indicators.

Kindergarten Readiness, 2006/07 – 2009/10

Definition: This indicator reflects the composite score from the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR). The MMSR is an assessment of kindergarten students to determine if they have the social, physical, linguistic, and cognitive skills to be successful in kindergarten. It is a percentage of the number of kindergarten students demonstrating readiness.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **7th** highest percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating readiness on the MMSR for the 2009/2010 school year.

	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Frederick	76%	76%	77%	87%
Carroll	60%	63%	69%	96%
Harford	83%	82%	84%	82%
Howard	71%	76%	76%	82%
Montgomery	68%	70%	73%	76%
Washington	65%	69%	72%	73%
Maryland	67%	68%	73%	78%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

School Absence, 2004-2009

Definition: This data element is the percentage of all students who missed more than twenty days of school during the school year.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **10th** lowest percentage of students who missed more than twenty days of school in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	9.9%	9.9%	10.9%	9.7%	9.0%	9.6%
Carroll	7.2%	7.4%	8.1%	6.7%	7.3%	6.8%
Harford	11.3%	11.7%	12.6%	9.7%	10.1%	10.6%
Howard	6.9%	7.1%	7.1%	7.2%	5.6%	5.5%
Montgomery	7.4%	8.4%	8.3%	7.5%	7.9%	6.9%
Washington	4.7%	5.5%	4.8%	12.1%	6.4%	6.3%
Maryland	13.1%	13.4%	13.0%	11.7%	12.0%	11.3%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education

Dropout Rate, 2005-2010

Definition: This data element is the percentage of public school students, grades 9 through 12, who withdrew from school before graduation or completing a Maryland approved educational program.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **2nd** lowest percentage of students who withdrew from school before graduation in 2010.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Frederick	0.7%	0.8%	0.96%	1.72%	1.65%	1.18%
Carroll	1.2%	1.4%	1.50%	1.22%	1.07%	0.94%
Harford	3.1%	3.2%	3.16%	2.92%	2.32%	2.13%
Howard	1.4%	1.4%	1.23%	1.40%	1.39%	1.39%
Montgomery	1.8%	2.0%	2.71%	2.87%	2.72%	1.98%
Washington	1.9%	2.2%	2.54%	1.67%	1.56%	1.83%
Maryland	3.7%	3.6%	3.50%	3.4%	2.80%	2.50%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

High School Program Completion, 2005-2010

Definition: This data element is the percentage of graduating students who have completed the minimum requirements for admission into the University System of Maryland in addition to completion of requirements to receive a high school diploma.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had **the highest** percentage of students who completed minimum requirements for admission into USM in 2010.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Frederick	60.2%	66.5%	67.8%	67.8%	68.7%	73.7%
Carroll	59.0%	60.3%	58.0%	58.0%	48.3%	45.7%
Harford	60.9%	61.6%	61.1%	61.1%	56.0%	47.6%
Howard	72.8%	62.2%	38.9%	38.9%	68.9%	67.1%
Montgomery	69.4%	70.6%	67.4%	67.4%	60.5%	73.7%
Washington	45.1%	54.0%	53.5%	53.5%	55.2%	55.2%
Maryland	57.0%	57.6%	55.7%	59.5%	55.3%	55.2%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

High School Graduation Rate Percentage, 2005-2010

Definition: The percentage of students who received a Maryland high school diploma during the reported school year. This is an estimated cohort rate. It is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of the dropouts for grades 9 through 12, respectively, in consecutive years, plus the number of high school graduates.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **2nd** highest Graduation Rate Percentage in the State of Maryland in 2010.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Frederick	94.97%	93.36%	96.22%	94.78%	94.08%	94.56%
Carroll	93.78%	95.07%	94.18%	93.81%	95.47%	95.31%
Harford	88.99%	87.22%	87.17%	86.72%	86.73%	88.38%
Howard	93.80%	94.11%	94.79%	94.87%	93.64%	94.31%
Montgomery	91.43%	91.58%	90.37%	89.08%	87.38%	90.01%
Washington	91.28%	90.48%	90.09%	91.41%	91.53%	92.36%
Maryland	84.83%	85.44%	85.24%	85.09%	85.24%	86.55%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

Child Abuse and Neglect, 2003-2008

Definitions: This data element is the rate of indicated child abuse and neglect investigations per 1,000 children 0-18.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **10th** lowest rate per 1,000 children of indicated child abuse and neglect cases in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	4.3	6.1	5.4			3.6
Carroll	4.9	4.0	3.5			5.1
Harford	3.6	3.0	3.0			3.4
Howard	2.9	2.1	2.5			1.7
Montgomery	1.8	1.7	1.8			1.8
Washington	14.1	13.7	12.7			11.9
Maryland	5.3	4.6	4.4			4.3

Note: No data available for 2006 or 2007 due to conversion to CHESSIE.

Data Source: Maryland Department of Human Resources and Governor's Office for Children – Results and Indicators

Juvenile Violent Offense Arrest Rate, 2003-2008

Definition: This rate is the number of arrests of juveniles for a violent offense (i.e. homicide, aggravated assault, forcible rape, robbery), per 100,000 youths ages 10-17.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **9th** lowest rate, per 100,000 youths, of juveniles arrested for a violent offense in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	274	315	165	256	281	324
Carroll	181	164	135	87	171	143
Harford	339	288	181	303	295	226
Howard	152	243	252	297	383	304
Montgomery	201	192	206	238	347	328
Washington	450	349	465	410	366	316
Maryland	499	504	491	590	562	591

Data Source: Governors Office for Children – Results and Indicators.

Juvenile Non-Violent Offense Arrests, 2003-2008

Definition: This rate is the number of arrests of juveniles for a non-violent offense (i.e. burglary, larceny theft, motor vehicle theft, etc.), per 100,000 youths ages 10-17.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **7th** lowest rate, per 100,000 youths, of juveniles arrested for a non-violent offense in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	1166	945	1025	1239	1018	1230
Carroll	1119	966	1039	503	664	726
Harford	1361	1123	1138	1169	1266	1308
Howard	1444	1407	1533	1589	1676	1801
Montgomery	744	519	611	584	756	708
Washington	2039	1234	1482	1379	1391	1024
Maryland	1869	1871	1758	1865	1873	1956

Data Source: Governors Office for Children – Results and Indicators.
Maryland State Police, Uniform Crime Reporting Division.

Juvenile Services, 2004-2009

Definition: This data element is the number of new juvenile service intake cases during the indicated year.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **18th** lowest number of intake cases during 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	1691	1609	1805	1713	1545	1696
Carroll	1396	1287	1310	1178	1205	1176
Harford	2104	1866	1950	1847	1774	1673
Howard	1662	1761	1475	1583	1449	1504
Montgomery	4227	3814	4177	3732	4354	3962
Washington	1688	1335	1449	1342	1280	1176
Maryland	53711	51458	53507	51157	51110	48506

Data Source: Maryland Department of Juvenile Services

Domestic Violence, 2003-2008

Definition: This rate is the number of victims served by the Department of Human Resources Victim Services per 100,000 households.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **10th** lowest rate per 100,000 households of victims served by DHR Victim Services in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	431.9	279.9	303.2	237.7	299.0	222.5
Carroll	177.8	175.6	342.2	754.8	381.0	304.8
Harford	2266.5	2310.3	959.8	375.8	638.0	388.9
Howard	359.4	282.6	476.4	421.2	418.0	187.6
Montgomery	314.5	258.4	350.2	355.6	330.0	290.5
Washington	962.3	828.0	1092.3	1160.8	1076.0	1089.0
Maryland	605.1	680.0	694.1	654.7	531.0	536.2

Data Source: Maryland Department of Human Resources.

Child Poverty, 2003-2008

Definition: This data element is the percentage of children under the age of 18 who live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level, as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **3rd** lowest percentage of children under the age of 18 living in families with incomes below the federal poverty level in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	6.6%	6.5%	5.7%	5.4%	6.4%	6.5%
Carroll	5.6%	5.5%	4.6%	4.5%	5.2%	6.4%
Harford	8.1%	7.8%	7.7%	6.6%	7.1%	7.3%
Howard	5.3%	5.3%	4.2%	4.5%	4.7%	4.9%
Montgomery	8.3%%	8.0%	5.7%	5.5%	5.9%	7.3%
Washington	14.1%%	13.4%	12.4%	12.1%	13.3%	12.9%
Maryland	11.5%	11.1%	10.9%	10.1%	10.6%	10.4%

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Child Poverty) – US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE).

Single Parent Households, 2007-2008

Definition: This data element is the percentage of all children under the 18 who live in households headed by a single parent.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **3rd** lowest percentage of children living in single parent households in 2008.

	2007	2008
Frederick	18.9%	21.9%
Carroll	17.7%	18.9%
Harford	22.0%	22.9%
Howard	18.4%	19.0%
Montgomery	21.9%	22.1%
Washington	30.7%	29.7%
Maryland	32.5%	32.8%

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

Out of Home Placements, 2004-2009

Definition: This data element is the out-of-home placement entry rate per 1,000 children.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **12th** lowest rate of out-of-home placements per 1,000 children in 2009.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Frederick	7.6	6.5	7.3	8.5	8.3	9.2
Carroll	6.1	7.6	7.3	5.5	8.6	8.2
Harford	6.6	6.3	5.0	7.7	7.0	6.9
Howard	3.0	3.4	3.1	4.4	4.1	4.0
Montgomery	5.0	5.5	5.4	4.4	4.6	5.2
Washington	15.5	17.4	15.3	22.5	15.7	18.2
Maryland	10.1	10.1	9.7	13.1	8.3	8.8

Data Source: Joint Commission Report on Out-of-Home Placements and Family Preservation Services.

Homeless Adults and Children, 2003-2008

Definition: This data element is the rate of adults and children receiving homeless services per 100,000 adults and children.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the **19th** lowest rate of adults and children per 100,000 adults and children receiving homeless services in 2008.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Frederick	654.6	607.5	561.9	693.2	645.9	657.4
Carroll	877.2	845.6	852.2	855.0	494.5	515.5
Harford	517.8	331.2	432.1	482.3	337.2	433.1
Howard	274.1	291.4	292.0	266.8	234.2	228.4
Montgomery	477.6	485.0	439.6	509.0	506.9	452.6
Washington	1846.6	1710.6	1381.6	1345.4	1360.7	1705.1
Maryland	834.7	696.9	625.6	668.4	651.7	673.7

Data Source: Maryland Department of Human Resources.

Frederick County Data Dashboard

The Frederick County Data Dashboard is a useful tool that presents data in one concise table, simultaneously depicting trends and the directionality of change in the data over the past 5 years. The dashboard below represents Frederick County's outcomes on Maryland's 8 Result areas for child and family well-being. Where available, State Comparison data is presented.

Legend:

Green indicates change in a positive direction.

Yellow indicates that there was no change.

Red indicates that change occurred in a negative direction.

Results & Indicators	5 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year	5-yr change (rate/ % change)	1-yr change (rate/ % change)	State Average (%)
Babies Born Healthy						
<i>Infant Mortality (rate per 1,000)</i>	3.2 (2003)	3.9 (2007)	8.4 (2008)	5.2	4.5	8.0 (2008)
<i>Low Birth Weight</i>	6.5% (2003)	8.3% (2007)	8.0% (2008)	1.5	0.3	9.3 (2008)
<i>Births to Adolescents</i>						
<i>Ages 15-19 (rate per 1,000)</i>	24.8 (2002)	23.7 (2006)	26.1 (2007)	1.3	2.4	34.4 (2007)
Healthy Children						
<i>Immunizations (MD Only) (children 19 – 35 months old)</i>	81.8% (2002)	83.5% (2006)	91.3% (2007)	9.5	7.8	91.3 (2007)
<i>Injuries (rate per 100,000 – Children ages 0 – 19)</i>	(2001)	(2005)	(2006)			
Unintentional	3.5	3.8	3.21	0.29	0.59	4.42 (2006)
Assaults	0.1	***	***	0.1	0	.45 (2006)
Self-Inflicted	0.2	0.3	***	0.2	0.3	.31 (2006)

<i>Deaths (rate per 100,000 – Children ages 1-19 years)</i>	22.6	18.0	45.3	22.7	27.3	30.7 (2006)
<i>Substance Abuse--8th grade (%)</i>	(2002)	(2004)	(2007)			
Cigarettes	5.3%	6.1%	2.7%	2.6	3.4	4.2 (2007)
Alcohol	9.6%	13.3%	8.7%	0.9	4.6	12.7 (2007)
Marijuana	4.3%	4.8%	2.2%	2.1	2.6	4.6 (2007)
Children Enter School Ready to Learn						
<i>Kindergarten Assessment (Composite Score)</i>	(2005)	(2008)	(2009)			
Full Readiness	65%	76%	68%	3%	8%	
Developing Readiness	8%	4%	4%	4%	4%	
Children Successful in School	(2002)	(2006)	(2007)			
<i>Absence from School</i>	10.2%	10.9%	9.7%	0.5%	1.2	
<i>Academic Performance-Advanced Performance</i>	(2004)	(2008)	(2009)			
3- Grade Reading	11.9%	16.3%	23%	11.1	6.7	
3- Grade Math	17.4%	25.2%	29.9%	12.5	4.7	
5- Grade Reading	32.4%	57.8%	56.4%	24	1.4	
5- Grade Math	15.1%	24.2%	24.2%	9.1	0	
8- Grade Reading	25.1%	42.4%	43.7%	18.6	1.3	
8- Grade Math	24.9%	38.1%	34.2%	9.3	3.9	
<i>Demonstrated Basic Skills</i>						
Algebra						
Biology						
English 2						

Government						
Children Completing School						
<i>Dropout Rate</i>	1.3% (2003)	.96% (2007)	1.72% (2008)	0.42	0.76	3.4 (2008)
<i>High School Program Completion- Univ. of MD</i>	69.5% (2003)	67.8% (2007)	67.8% (2008)	1.7	0	59.5 (2008)
<i>High School Diploma</i>						87.4 (2007)
<i>High School Program Completion-Diploma & Univ. of MD)</i>						
Children Safe in their Families & Communities						
<i>Abuse or Neglect- ruled as indicated or unsubstantiated (per 1,000)</i>	8.9 (2003)		7.5 (2008)	1.4		8.5 (2008)
<i>Deaths due to Injury (rate per 100,000)</i>	(2001)	(2005)	(2006)			
Accidents	16.6	9.8	24	7.4	14.2	9.9 (2006)
Homicide	***	***	***	0	0	6.4 (2006)
Suicide	***	***	***	0	0	1.4 (2006)
<i>Juvenile Violent Offense (rates per 100,000 - ages 10 - 17</i>	331 (2002)	256 (2006)	281 (2007)			562 (2007)
<i>Juvenile Non-violent Offense (rates per 100,000 - ages 10 - 17</i>	1236 (2002)	1239 (2006)	1018 (2007)	218	221	1873 (2007)
Stable & Economically Independent Families						
<i>Child Poverty</i>	5.3% (2002)	5.4% (2006)	6.4% (2007)	1.1	1	10.6% (2007)

<i>Single Parent Households</i>	17.6% (2000)	13% (2007)	14.3% (2008)	3.3	1.3	33% (2007)
<i>Out of Home Placements (rate per 1,000)</i>	8.3 (2002)	7.3 (2006)	5.9 (2007)	2.4	1.4	8.5 (2007)
<i>Permanent Placements</i>						
% Reunified w/in 12 months	75.9% (2003)	38.5% (2007)	52.5% (2008)	23.4	14	50.9% (2008)
% Adopted w/in 24 months	31.3% (2003)	25% (2007)	25% (2008)	6.3	0	25.5% (2008)
<i>Homeless Adults & Children (rate per 100,000)</i>	604.1 (2002)	693.2 (2006)	645.9 (2007)	41.8	47.3	651.7 (2007)

*** Insufficient data to determine rates

N/A - Data not available

Community-Wide Needs Assessment: Focus Groups

From October 2009 to March 2010, a total of 29 focus groups were conducted by Local Management Board staff and members. Provider focus groups were planned to include all LMB subcommittees (the Local Coordinating Council, the Interagency Early Childhood Committee and the Juvenile Delinquency Policy and Prevention Board), as well as 2-1-1 call specialists and a cross section of providers. Ten family focus groups were conducted with parents from across the county including families participating in advisory councils in identified high-risk communities, Head Start, alternative education, foster care, community mental health and the Police Activities League. These focus groups were held at times/locations most convenient for families, and in most cases, meals were provided through community partners. Cultural competence was addressed through the partnership of in-kind translators, as needed.

A total of 175 youth responses were received from 13 focus groups that were conducted with youth from age 11 through ages 21. Focus groups included each of the county's middle school after school programs (both LMB programs and Community Learning Centers), four groups of youth receiving respite programming and transition-aged youth receiving community mental health services.

Partners and Participants

Community Boards and Inter-Agency Collaboratives

Local Management Board (LMB)

- Frederick County Public Schools
- Frederick County Health Department
- Department of Social Services
- Frederick County Citizen Services Division
- Department of Juvenile Services
- Developmental Disabilities Administration
- Frederick County Finance Division
- Frederick County Head Start
- Mental Health Management Agency
- Frederick County Family Partnership
- Frederick City Police
- Child Care Choices
- Heartly House
- Way Station, Inc.
- Private Citizens (3)

Interagency Early Childhood Committee (IECC)

- Child Care Choices
- Frederick County Health Department
- Frederick County Public Schools
- Judy Center
- Frederick County Head Start
- Healthy Families Frederick
- The Children's Center - Walkersville
- Frederick County Family Partnership
- Frederick Memorial Hospital
- Calvary Weekday School
- The ARC of Frederick County

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Policy Board (JDPPB)

- Frederick County Department of Juvenile Services
- Private Citizen (1)
- Frederick County Office for Children and Families
- Mental Health Association
- Frederick County Public Schools
- Community Agency School Services

Local Coordinating Council (LCC)

- Frederick County Public Schools
- Mental Health Management Agency/CSA
- Frederick County Health Department – Substance Abuse
- Frederick County Department of Social Services
- Frederick County Department of Juvenile Services
- Department of Health and Mental Hygiene – DDA
- Parent Advocate

Single Point of Access (2-1-1) Call Specialists

Service Coordination

Up County Family Center

Family Preservation

Head Start Policy Council

Families and Caregivers

Sagner Neighborhood/Community

Carver Neighborhood/Community

Lincoln Neighborhood/Community

Hope Alive

Hillcrest Elementary (Police Activities League)

Up County Family Center

Way Station Parent Support Group

Department of Social Services Foster Parent Support Group

Head Start Policy Council

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI)

Youth

Camp Journey Respite Program (4 groups)

Local Management Board After School Programs (5 groups)

21st Century Community Learning Center Programs (2 groups)

Transition Aged Youth Program

Family Preservation Program

Methodology

Focus group questions were developed and finalized by Local Management Board members and staff. Each focus group participant received a single sheet of paper containing the focus group questions at the beginning of the group. Participants were asked to record their responses on the paper, as well as participate in a group discussion about each question. All sessions were led by at least one Local Management Board member or staff. Responses were recorded, compiled, and assigned to categories by LMB staff. Categories with more than a single response ($n > 1$) are displayed in the tables below.

Results - Community Boards and Interagency Collaboratives

1. Please list three (3) strengths of the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Specific programs/initiatives/agencies (see list)	61	38.13%
Collaboration across all agencies	43	26.88%
Variety/ Comprehensive services	17	10.63%
Agency professionalism/commitment	10	6.25%
Collaboration within early childhood community	7	4.38%
Innovative non-duplicative services	7	4.38%
Collaboration within LCC	6	3.75%
Service accessibility / availability	5	3.13%
Treatment built on natural/local supports	2	1.25%
Other	2	1.25%
	160	

Specific Programs (n>1):

2-1-1	15
Infants & Toddlers	6
Mobile Crisis	6
CASS	3
Local Management Board	3
Child Care Choices	2
Family Partnership	2
Health Care Coalition	2
Health Department/WIC	2
Judy Center	2
Local Coordinating Council	2
Rock Creek School	2
Way Station, Inc.	2

2. Please list three (3) weaknesses of the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Limitations / lack of specific services	48	27.27%
Economic downturn / decrease in staffing and services	25	14.20%
Barriers with specific agencies	20	11.36%
Transportation	11	6.25%
System barriers / eligibility criteria / bureaucracy	11	6.25%
Lack of resources / housing for homeless families	10	5.68%
Awareness / linking to resources	9	5.11%
Services / opportunities for children and adolescents with disabilities	8	4.55%
Barriers / lack of resources for low income families	7	3.98%
Lack of interpreters / agency cultural competence	7	3.98%
Barriers / lack of resources for ELL families	6	3.41%
No single point of entry/ "one stop shop"	4	2.27%
Family Communication / follow-through	4	2.27%
Increased professional development / cross-agency trainings	2	1.14%
Interagency communication	2	1.14%
Other	2	1.14%
	176	100%

3. Please list three (3) barriers to children and families accessing the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Transportation	32	25.20%
Awareness of service	17	13.39%
Insufficient family finances / Families cannot afford services,	12	9.45%
Availability of specific services (see list)	11	8.66%
Families lacking health insurance / limited insurance coverage	10	7.87%
Programs operating at capacity / waiting lists	7	5.51%
Policies which encourage fear / distrust in ELL families	6	4.72%
Lack of interpreters / agency cultural competence	6	4.72%
Language and cultural barriers	5	3.94%
Decrease in funding / resources / staffing	4	3.15%
Other	3	2.36%
Restrictive eligibility criteria for services	3	2.36%
System / agency demands on families	3	2.36%
Affordable housing	2	1.57%
Interagency communication	2	1.57%
Available / Affordable childcare	2	1.57%
Family follow-through	2	1.57%
Lack of direct youth access to services	2	1.57%
Specific agency barriers	2	1.57%
	127	100%
Specific Services (n>1):		
Shelter care/emergency shelter	4	
Access to health care (including dental and vision)	3	
Access to mental health care (including psychiatric and crisis care)	2	
Access to residential programs/group homes	2	

4a. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 0-5, and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Limitations / lack of specific services (see list)	25	24.27%
Parenting education / resources	14	13.59%
Insufficient family finances	12	11.65%
Loss of specific agency funding / resources (see list below)	9	8.74%
Affordable / available childcare	9	8.74%
Other	8	7.77%
Awareness of services	7	6.80%
Lack of housing resources / housing for homeless families	7	6.80%
Transportation	3	2.91%
Lack of interpreters / agency cultural competence	3	2.91%
Lack of food resources	2	1.94%
Interagency barriers	2	1.94%
Barriers for ESL families	2	1.94%
	103	100%

Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

Early intervention / prevention	4
Behavioral intervention	4
Autism services	4
Mental health services	2
Disability education	2
Health Department services	2
Dental care	2
Summer access to Child Find	2

Loss of funding / resources (n>1):

WIC	2
Prevention programs	2

4b. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 6-12, and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Limitations/lack of specific services (see list)	22	20.75%
Affordable, quality after school programs	19	17.92%
Parent education / support groups	11	10.38%
Lack of respite services	8	7.55%
Insufficient family finances	7	6.60%
Lack of funding / services for prevention	7	6.60%
Lack of supervision / dual income families	6	5.66%
Lack of special education services / supports	6	5.66%
Limited early intervention/prevention	5	4.72%
Family stressors/unstable family structure	5	4.72%
Lack of role mentors / role models	5	4.72%
School system barriers	5	4.72%
Transportation	4	3.77%
Lack of health insurance / health care	3	2.83%
Awareness of services	3	2.83%
Other	2	1.89%
	106	100%

Specific Limitations (n>1):

Recreational activities	3
Sex offender treatment	2
Autism services	2
Housing	2
Wrap-around services	2

4c. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 13-18, and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Limitations / lack of specific services (see list)	41	34.17%
Lack of role models / mentors	14	11.67%
Vocational training / programming	10	8.33%
Parent education / support	9	7.50%
Lack of parental supervision	8	6.67%
Lack of youth engagement	8	6.67%
Constructive / quality after school programming	6	5.00%
Truancy	6	5.00%
Insufficient family finances	5	4.17%
Recreational programming	5	4.17%
Sex education / teen pregnancy	4	3.33%
Overall lack of services for this population and their families	4	3.33%
School system barriers Expectations	3	2.50%
Transportation	2	1.67%
School concerns for youth with developmental disabilities	2	1.67%
	120	100%

Limitations (n>1):

Mental health services	5
Behavioral intervention	4
Fire setting treatment	3
Lack of respite	3
Sex offender treatment	3
Autism services	2
Crisis intervention	2
Lack of foster homes	2
Lack of group homes	2

4d. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 19-21 and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Transitional housing / homelessness	16	13.01%
Employment opportunities	13	10.57%
Lack of health insurance	11	8.94%
Vocational training / programming	10	8.13%
Lack of transition services for youth with intensive needs	10	8.13%
Aging out of needed programs	9	7.32%
Lack of independent living skills	8	6.50%
Lack of services for youth with developmental disabilities until age 21	8	6.50%
Limitations / lack of specific services	7	5.69%
Mentoring	5	4.07%
Inadequate education / Lack of diploma	5	4.07%
Lack of family support / stability	5	4.07%
Other	4	3.25%
Transportation	4	3.25%
Financial planning / literacy	4	3.25%
Lack of youth engagement	4	3.25%
	123	100%

5. If you could improve three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system, what would they be?

Response	n	%
Addition / expansion of specific services (see list)	58	38.67%
Adequate / stable funding for programs and resources	16	10.67%
Better service coordination / interagency communication	14	9.33%
Improved access to services / single point of entry	13	8.67%
Financial supports for families	8	5.33%
Increase parent education / support	8	5.33%
Improved cultural competence within agencies / system	7	4.67%
Other	6	4.00%
Increase awareness of services for families and providers	6	4.00%
DSS concerns / issues	5	3.33%
Transportation	5	3.33%
Expand eligibility criteria for services	4	2.67%
Agency response time	2	1.33%
	150	100%

Specific Services (n>1):

Services for homeless families	24
Mobile Crisis (increase to 24/7)	6
Transitioning services	5
Respite (increase)	4
Improved case management	3
Mental health services	3
School based wellness centers	3
Early education	2
Emergency dept. psych evals	2
Housing	2
In home services	2
Vocational opportunities	2

6. What three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system are working well and should be maintained?

Response	n	%
Specific services (see list)	72	59.02%
Collaboration	20	16.39%
Specific initiatives / entities (see list)	10	8.20%
Prevention / early intervention services	8	6.56%
Variety of services	5	4.10%
Early childhood / child care quality improvement initiatives	5	4.10%
Other	2	1.64%
	122	100%

Specific Services (n>1):

2-1-1	12	Family Partnership	2
CASS	10	Multisystemic Therapy (MST)	2
Systems Navigation	8	Rock Creek School	2
Infants & Toddlers	5	Success Program	2
Mobile Crisis	5	TBI Program	2
Head Start	4		
After School Programs	3		
Family Preservation	3	Specific Entities (n>1):	
Judy Center	3	Local Management Board	3
Service Coordination	3	Community Action Agency	2
Transition Services	3	Local Coordinating Council	2
Child Care Choices	2		

7. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of cultural competence in the current service delivery system?

Yes 10

No 41

What could be improved?

Response	n	%
Need cultural competence training across agencies	22	46.81%
Increase cultural diversity of staff / bilingual providers	11	23.40%
Cost of interpretation services	6	12.77%
Improvements in past several years but more is needed	4	8.51%
Cost of interpretation services	4	8.51%
Awareness of increasing diversity within community	4	7.84%
Other	3	5.88%
	51	100%

8. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of family involvement in guiding the current service delivery system?

Yes 14

No 36

What could be improved?

Response	n	%
Increase opportunities for meaningful family engagement, input	16	44.44%
Families stressed, overburdened / competing priorities	10	27.78%
Acknowledgement of differences in family involvement	4	11.11%
Encourage family evaluation of services	3	8.33%
Homeless services which fragment families	3	8.33%
Other	2	5.56%
Family frustration with agency / system barriers	2	5.56%
	40	100%

Results - Families and Caregivers

1. What are the ages of your children?

Age Range	n
0-5	44
6-12	34
13-18	10
19-21	6

2. Based on your experiences, what do you consider to be the three (3) biggest problems for children and families in Frederick County?

Response	n	%
Lack or limitations of specific programs	16	15.84%
Access to healthcare / insurance, MA issues	10	9.90%
Affordable housing / housing assistance	10	9.90%
More recreational activities	9	8.91%
Transportation	9	8.91%
Affordable, flexible childcare	6	5.94%
Concerns with court system	4	3.96%
Cost of services / treatment	4	3.96%
Family stress/ services only available 9-5	4	3.96%
Lack of financial assistance	4	3.96%
Need more / improved playgrounds, parks	4	3.96%
Other	4	3.96%
Traffic/lack of crosswalks	4	3.96%
Concerns with one specific agency	3	2.97%
Barriers / eligibility procedures for services	2	1.98%
Inexperienced/unprofessional staff	2	1.98%
Lack of jobs	2	1.98%
Male role models	2	1.98%
	101	100%

3. Based on your knowledge of child and family services in Frederick County, what do you think are the three (3) greatest strengths of the system?

Response	n	%
Specific programs	77	83.70%
Community outreach / family engagement	7	7.61%
Variety of activities for children, youth	3	3.26%
Relationship with staff	2	2.17%
Knowledge of providers / linkage to other services	2	2.17%
Other	1	1.09%
	92	100%

4. Based on your knowledge of child and family services in Frederick County what do you think are the three (3) greatest weaknesses?

Response	n	%
Other	35	41.67%
Specific agency/ program/system concerns	11	13.10%
Transportation / lack of bus routes	7	8.33%
Access to health care: medical, dental and mental health	5	5.95%
Training opportunities for parents	5	5.95%
Awareness of resources	4	4.76%
Lack of affordable housing / housing assistance	4	4.76%
Programs at capacity / waiting lists	4	4.76%
Affordable, flexible day care	3	3.57%
Court system concerns	2	2.38%
Restrictive eligibility criteria for services, benefits	2	2.38%
Expand operating hours of agencies	2	2.38%
	84	100%

5. Based on your knowledge of child and family services in Frederick County, what are the three (3) greatest barriers to accessing services?

Response	n	%
Other	35	43.75%
Concerns with one specific agency	7	8.75%
Transportation / lack of bus routes	7	8.75%
Lack of computer / internet access	5	6.25%
Lack of funds for basic needs	5	6.25%
Affordable housing / housing assistance	4	5%
Barriers to services / bureaucracy	4	5%
Restrictive eligibility criteria for services, benefits	4	5%
Lack of awareness of resources	3	3.75%
Cost of services, co-pays	2	2.50%
Expand operating hours of agencies	2	2.50%
Affordable, flexible childcare	2	2.50%
	80	100%

6. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of cultural competence in the current child and family service system?

Yes 16

No 16

What could be improved?

Response	n	%
Continues to improve	7	46.67%
Other	4	26.67%
Need more interpreters	2	13.33%
Need continues to grow	2	13.33%
	15	100%

7. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of family involvement in guiding the current child/ and family service system?

Yes 16

No 23

What could be improved?

Response	n	%
Families are not asked for feedback	8	50%
Other	6	37.50%
Lack of awareness of resources / need for family services guide	2	12.50%
	16	100%

Results - Youth

1. What do you think are the three (3) biggest problems that youth your age are experiencing today?

Response	n	%
Substance abuse/resisting drugs	39	14.08%
Education/homework problems/pressure to do well	33	11.91%
Social problems/making friends	30	10.83%
Bullying	27	9.75%
Peer pressure	23	8.30%
Pregnancy/lack of sex education	22	7.94%
Violence/fighting	21	7.58%
Problems with staff/teachers	21	7.58%
Family issues	11	3.97%
Financial concerns/housing/hunger/employment	11	3.97%
Alcohol abuse/resisting drinking	8	2.89%
Emotional problems/depression	8	2.89%
Boredom/lack of recreational opportunities	6	2.17%
Smoking	6	2.17%
Puberty	6	2.17%
Health concerns/getting sick	5	1.81%
	277	100%

2. What supports or programs do you wish were available for youth your age?

Response	n	%
More after-school clubs/offer more variety	83	40.89%
After-school sports programs/intramural sports	48	23.65%
Job/life skills	22	10.84%
Recreational/social opportunities	14	6.90%
Mental health supports/someone to listen	8	3.94%
Bullying/gang prevention classes	7	3.45%
Drug prevention programs	6	2.96%
Sex prevention/education	5	2.46%
Food/housing	5	2.46%
Concerns with appearance	5	2.46%
	203	100%

Community-Wide Needs Assessment: Web-Based Survey

On March 1, 2010 a web-based survey was released to over 60 Frederick County child-serving agencies, as well as local and state elected officials, who were identified by the Local Management Board as key sources of information about community needs and resources for children and families. A reminder was sent on March 10th and the survey closed at midnight on March 11th. In total, 188 surveys were completed.

Survey Recipients

Advocates for the Homeless
Ausherman Family Foundation
Behavioral Health Partners of Frederick
Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Boys and Girls Club
Community Action Agency
Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
Department of Rehabilitative Services (DORS)
Department of Juvenile Services
Department of Social Services
Families Plus
Fort Detrick Family Support Center
Family Service Foundation
Frederick Alliance for Youth
Frederick City Housing
Mayor of Frederick
Frederick City Police
Frederick Community College
Frederick County Delegation
Frederick County Government
 Board of County Commissioners
 Child Advocacy Center
 Family Partnership
 Head Start
 Health Department
 Housing
 Parks & Recreation

Sheriff's Office
Workforce Services
Frederick County Public Schools
Adult Education
CASS
Curriculum
Even Start
Judy Center
Psychological Services
Student Services
Frederick Memorial Hospital
Goodwill
Healthy Families Frederick
Heartly House
Hope Alive, Inc.
Institute for Family Centered Services
Jefferson School
Maryland Cooperative Extension
Maryland Sheriff's Youth Ranch
Maryland School for the Deaf
Mental Health Association
Mental Health Management Agency
Mission of Mercy
National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI)
Religious Coalition
Rescue Mission
SAFE Kids
Salvation Army
Seton Center
TeamLink
The ARC of Frederick County
The Frederick Community Meditation and Conflict Resolution Center (CALM)
ThorpeWood, Inc.
UNESCO Center for Peace
United Way
Up County Family Center
Villa Maria of Frederick County
Volunteer Frederick
Way Station, Inc.

YMCA

Young Rembrants

Youth Advisory Council

Methodology

The eight-question web survey was developed by LMB members and staff to complement the information obtained through the focus groups. The survey was created and disseminated through surveymonkey.com. Surveys were emailed to agency directors, supervisors and managers with a request to both complete the survey and to forward it to agency colleagues and staff. A request was included to forgo completing the survey if the recipient had already participated in a focus group, but to instead only forward the survey.

Opportunities throughout the survey to explain responses or to insert additional information generated hundreds of additional comments and responses. These responses were assigned to categories by LMB staff. Categories with more than a single response ($n > 1$) are displayed in the tables below.

Results

1. Based on your personal and/or professional experience, what do you consider to be the three (3) biggest problems for children and families in Frederick County? Please choose up to three (3) for each age group.

Option	Children 0-5	Children 6-12	Children 13-18	Children 19-21	# of Res- pondents
Lack of parenting skills/knowledge/support/parental involvement	93	79	64	38	125
Lack of role models/mentoring/positive influences	29	72	90	59	124
Lack of affordable childcare	115	61	7	9	123
Lack of afterschool programs/activities/supervision	15	89	77	10	117
Lack of jobs/vocational training/career development	3	4	41	101	108
Lack of transitional programming/services for older youth	3	7	41	83	98
Increase in gang activity/negative peer influences	2	31	80	49	97
Lack of affordable housing	61	51	39	52	89

Option	Children 0-5	Children 6-12	Children 13-18	Children 19-21	# of Res- pondents
Knowing what services are available	52	34	27	30	86
Life skills	5	11	42	55	75
Lack of affordable/available mental health services	32	43	45	41	68
Lack of affordable/available primary healthcare	42	36	27	36	64
Lack of sufficient early education services	54	18	6	3	60
Lack of affordable/available dental services	37	37	27	19	56
Lack of affordable, nutritious foods	36	28	20	12	48
Lack of sex education / increase in teen pregnancy	1	15	43	20	47
Other (please specify)					17

Other: (n>1)

Lack of emergency housing for homeless families	3
Lack of effective/affordable mental health services	2
Lack of housing for those with disabilities	2
Lack of job opportunities and training for teens/young adults	2
Funding cuts / loss of services	2
Lack of health insurance	2
Substance abuse prevention	2
Lack of recreational activities for youth	2

2. Based on your knowledge and experience working with children and families in Frederick County, please indicate up to three (3) strengths of the current service delivery system.

Response	n	%
Dedication and commitment of service providers	141	75%
Coordination/Collaboration/Partnering between agencies	103	54.8%
Availability of Resources/Services for families	89	47.3%
Variety/Availability of Programs	41	21.8%
Convenient/central services	37	19.7%
Specific Programs (see list)	36	19.1%
Other strengths and/or specific programs (see list)	32	

Other strengths / Specific Programs (n>1):

CASS	5	Angel Food Ministries	2
Head Start	5	ARC of Frederick County	2
Health Department	5	Behavioral Health Partners	2
Healthy Families Frederick	5	Camp Journey Respite Program	2
Infants and Toddlers Program	5	Care Net Pregnancy Center	2
Boys and Girls Club	4	Community Action Agency	2
Family Partnership	4	Family Preservation Program	2
Judy Center	3	Frederick Alliance for Youth	2
Systems Navigation	3	Frederick Memorial Hospital	2
2-1-1	3	Hope Alive, INC	2
Family Literacy Program / Even Start	3	Mental Health Association	2
Family Partnership	3	Police Activities League	2
Local Management Board	3	Religious Coalition	2
Way Station	3	Villa Maria	2

3. Based on your knowledge and experiences working with children and families in Frederick County, what are three (3) barriers to children and families accessing the current service delivery system?

Response	n	%
Awareness of services/resources	102	54.3%
Transportation/Lack of regional services	93	49.5%
Parenting Skills/Knowledge/Support	73	38.8%
Eligibility criteria	66	35.1%
Services not available when working parents can access them	63	33.5%
Language/Cultural Barriers/Lack of Interpreters	59	31.4%
Affordability of services	49	26.1%
Communication between agencies	40	21.3%
Service/agency hours	19	10.1%
Other (please specify)	10	

Other (n>1):

No emergency shelter for families	2
Income eligibility limits	2
Reimbursement rates too low	2
Cost of interpreters	2
Budget cuts/limited safety net for vulnerable citizens	2

4. If you could improve three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system, what would they be?

Response	n	%
Increase awareness of services	89	47.3%
Improve/provide transportation	86	45.7%
Increase focus on parenting strategies	82	43.6%
Eliminate gaps in services	79	42%
Improve access to services	67	35.6%
Improve language/cultural capabilities	64	34%
Improve communication between agencies	53	28.2%
Increase array of services available	38	20.2%
Other (please specify)	8	

Other (n>1):

Improve response to the housing/homeless crisis	3
Access to good paying jobs for parents	2
Vocational programming for young adults	2

5. Listed below are a number of social services and supports. Please check the appropriate circle to indicate how well these services and supports are currently meeting the needs of residents in Frederick County. If you are unaware of a service in Frederick County that would meet a specific need, please choose "N/A".

Answer Options	Meets No Needs	Meets Some Needs	Meets Most Needs	Meets All Needs	N/A	Rating	n
Organized Recreational Activities	2	87	66	9	18	2.25	182
Childcare Services	3	101	64	3	13	2.22	184
Primary Healthcare Services	3	82	68	8	22	2.2	183
Afterschool Programs	0	111	53	5	15	2.18	184
Mental Health Crisis Support Services	4	83	62	9	23	2.17	181
Parenting Skill Programs/Resources	8	109	47	3	17	2.06	184
Disability Services	3	78	69	3	33	2.03	186
Outpatient Mental Health Services	4	86	57	6	32	2.01	185
Low Income Housing Services	9	124	32	2	16	1.97	183
Homeless Services	6	106	47	2	26	1.96	187
Transportation Services	12	103	39	3	22	1.94	179
Addiction Services	1	75	66	2	41	1.93	185
Literacy/Tutoring Support	9	73	56	5	41	1.86	184
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services	6	86	45	5	40	1.83	182
Mentoring Services	10	102	34	2	33	1.79	181
Dental Services	10	116	27	2	33	1.76	188
Inpatient Mental Health Services	18	83	39	5	39	1.74	184
Foster Care Services	0	72	48	3	59	1.65	182
Support Services for 18-21 year olds	20	98	19	2	46	1.52	185
Transitional Housing for Older Youth	29	79	11	3	60	1.27	182
Other (please specify)							12

Other (n>1):

Job training/Internships for young adults	2	Emergency shelter for families	2
Increase awareness of resources	2	Violence/drug prevention for young adults	2
Inpatient mental health services for children/adolescents	2		
Services for youth with developmental disabilities	2		

6. If you chose a response of "Meets No Needs" or "Meets Some Needs" in Question #5, please provide further explanation. For example: If you chose "Meets Some Needs" for Inpatient Mental Health Services, do you feel that the agencies offering these services are not providing a quality service or do you feel that the need for these services is greater than the ability of the agency(cies) to provide them?

Response	Availability	Quality
Low Income Housing Services	71	2
Dental Services	70	0
Afterschool Programs	66	3
Childcare Services	64	1
Support Services for 18-21 year olds	57	1
Transportation Services	54	5
Parenting Skill Programs/Resources	56	3
Homeless Services	56	1
Inpatient Mental Health Services	52	2
Mentoring Services	53	0
Transitional Housing for Older Youth	45	0
Outpatient Mental Health Services	44	3
Mental Health Crisis Support Services	45	1
Addiction Services	44	5
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services	42	0
Disability Services	36	3
Primary Healthcare Services	35	0
Literacy/Tutoring Support	34	1
Organized Recreational Activities	32	0
Foster Care Services	21	11

7. Cultural Competence can be defined as a set of congruent behaviors, values, attitudes and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals, which enables effective work in cross-cultural situations (National Center for Cultural Competence). Rate the degree to which you feel that Frederick County's child and family service system is culturally competent.

	Full Competence	Moderate Competence	Limited Competence	No Competence	Rating Average	Response Count
Frederick County's child and family service system.	20	127	41	0	2.11	188

Recommendations for improvement (n>1):

More Interpreters/funding for interpretation	6
More bilingual staff	5
More accepting professional/community climate	5
Train providers about common cultural barriers	4
Train providers about increasingly diverse cultures in county	4
Train providers on best ways to reach out to minority cultures	3
Agencies already providing culturally competent services	3
Loss of culturally competent services through budget cuts	3
More translation of agency documents	2
Certified translators for deaf clients	2

8. Family Involvement can mean that families have a primary decision making role in service provision for their own children, and direct and meaningful input into the programs, policies and systems affecting services for all children in their community (National Federation of Families/Council on Children and Families). Rate the degree to which you feel that family involvement is utilized to guide Frederick County's service system for children and families.

	Full Involvement	Moderate Involvement	Limited Involvement	No Involvement	Rating Average	Response Count
Frederick County's child and family service system.	22	115	51	0	2.15	188

Recommendations for improvement (n>1):

Educate parents/consumers about their rights	5
Increase system/agency accessibility	5
Directly seek family feedback	5
More parent/family advocates	3
Funding constraints limit family involvement	3
Training on reaching resistant families	3
Assistance with childcare barriers	3
Funding cuts depleting services for families	3
Agencies already providing family-involved services	2
Parent input regarding policy and systems issues	2
Less authoritative agency/system environment	2
Family involvement in goal setting/service planning	2
More parent advisory committees	2